

Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Uchiyama (US 6,163,409). Claims 6, 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by, or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over, Uchiyama.

Claim 1 has been amended so as to further distinguish the present invention from Uchiyama. Further, new claim 12 has been added.

It is submitted that the above-mentioned rejections are no longer applicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is patentable over Uchiyama, since claim 1 recites an optical pickup device including, in part, a light path length conversion unit operable to lengthen light path length of a light, by having the light pass therethrough, the light path length conversion unit being provided between a synthesizing unit and a converging unit. Uchiyama fails to disclose or suggest the light path length conversion unit as recited in claim 1.

Uchiyama discloses an optical head including first and second light sources 11 and 21. The optical head also includes a beam splitter 13-1, a collimator lens 14, a prism 15, a dichroic filter 19 and an objective lens 16. During operation, the beam splitter 13-1 receives a light beam from either the first or second light source 11 and 21 and guides the beam to the collimator lens 14. The collimator lens 14 focuses the beam into a parallel beam and directs the parallel beam to the surface of the prism 15. The parallel beam is reflected by the surface of the prism 15 through the dichroic filter 19 and the objective lens 16 and forms a beam spot on the surface of an optical disk. (See column 6, line 51 – column 7, line 34 and Figures 1 and 6A).

In the rejection, it is indicated that the prism 15 of Uchiyama corresponds to the claimed light path length conversion unit, the beam splitter 13-1 corresponds to the synthesizing unit, and the objective lens 16 corresponds to converging unit. However, as discussed above and is illustrated in Figures 1 and 6A of Uchiyama, the prism 15 reflects the laser beam at its surface. On the other hand, claim 1 recites that the light path length conversion unit is operable to lengthen light path length of a light, by having the light pass therethrough. It is apparent that the prism 15 does not operate in this manner. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over Uchiyama.

In addition to being patentable over Uchiyama for the reasons set forth above in support of claim 1, claim 12 also recites that the synthesizing unit includes a hexahedron beam splitter, and the first and second light sources are positioned such that the synthesizing unit receives the second light beam from a direction perpendicular to a direction of the first light beam. Uchiyama also fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 12.

As discussed above, Uchiyama does disclose the first and second light sources 11 and 21. However, Figure 1 of Uchiyama illustrates that the first and second light sources 11 and 21 are positioned in a manner whereby the light beams emitted therefrom are not perpendicular. As a result, Uchiyama also fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 12.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 1-12 are allowable over Uchiyama. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not have been motivated to modify Uchiyama or to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 1-12. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-12 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Seiji ONISHI et al.

By:



David M. Ovedovitz
Registration No. 45,336
Attorney for Applicants

DMO/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 13, 2006